

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/825,841 | FARTASH, ARJANG | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael La Villa | 1775 | |

All Participants:

(1) Michael La Villa.

(2) Mr. Coulman, Attny.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2005

Time: 11:30 a.m.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

54-56

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant explained that Claims 54-56 do not pertain to an apparatus for practicing the method of Claims 1 et seq. Rather, they are analogous to Claims 50 et seq., except that they are drafted in means plus function format; they are articles that could be produced by the method of Claims 1 et seq.



MICHAEL E. LAVILLA PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER